REMARKS

I.   Status of the Application

Claims 9-28 are pending in this application. In the March 17, 2008 office action, the

Examiner:

A.   Rejected claims 9, 11-16, 18-21 and 23-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,210,828 to Bolan et al. (hereinafter "Bolan") in view of

U.S. Patent No. 6,151,644 to Wu (hereinafter "Wu");

B.   Rejected claims 10, 17 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable

over Bolan and Wu, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,935,894 to Ternes (hereinafter

"Ternes").

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the consideration of the application given in the

Telephone Interview of May 15, 2008 ("Telephone Interview"). In response to the Final

Office Action and the Telephone Interview, applicants have amended claims 9, 16, 21 and 26.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the foregoing

amendments and accompanying remarks.

II.   The Telephone Interview

In the Telephone Interview, it was agreed that Bolan and Wu did not show a main

memory and an ancillary memory, which are of two different types, that otherwise satisfied

the limitations of claim 9. In particular, Bolan and Wu do not show "[storing] at least a first

data packet of the first message in the ancillary memory without storing the first data packet in

the main memory and [storing] at least one other data packet of the first message in the main memory", as claimed in claim 9.

In particular, it was agreed that the *main* memories 61, 62 and 63 of Bolan store the packets of each message. Thus, Bolan does not show "[storing] at least a first data packet of the first message in the ancillary memory *without storing the first data packet in the main memory*".

Similarly, it was agreed that the buffer memory 18 of Wu cannot be both the main memory *and* the ancillary memory (i.e. using different sections of the buffer memory), particularly if the claim recited that the memories are different units or types. (Cf. Interview Summary mailed May 21, 2008). Thus, Wu fails to show "[storing] at least a first data packet of the first message in the ancillary memory ... and [storing] at least one other data packet of the first message in the main memory", as claimed in claim 9.

III.   Claim 9

Claim 9 has been amended to incorporate limitations identifying that the ancillary memory and the main memory are of different types. This is supported in the specification at p.3, lines 14 and 25 (ancillary memory), and p.4, lines 1-4 & p.2, lines 3-24 (main memory).

As recommended by the Examiner, the claims have been amended "to distinguish explicitly between the ancillary memory and the main memory showing as two separate units". In particular, the claimed ancillary memory and main memory are of different types. As discussed above, neither Bolan nor Wu, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest "[storing] at least a first data packet of the first message in the ancillary memory without

storing the first data packet in the main memory and [storing] at least one other data packet of the first message in the main memory", as claimed in claim 9. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 9 over Bolan and Wu should be withdrawn.

IV.   Claims 16, 21 and 26

Similar to claim 9, claims 16, 21 and 26 have been amended to incorporate limitations identifying that the ancillary memory and the main memory are of different types. Also similar to claim 9, claims 16, 21 and 26 recite "storing at least a first data packet of the first message in the ancillary memory without storing the first data packet in the main memory, and storing one or more other data packets of the first message in the main memory", or something nearly identical thereto.

As discussed above, neither Bolan nor Wu, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest storing at least a first data packet of the first message in the ancillary memory without storing the first data packet in the main memory and storing at least one other data packet of the first message in the main memory. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 16, 21 and 26 over Bolan and Wu should be withdrawn.

V.   Claims 10-15, 17-20, 22-25 and 27-28

Each of claims 10-15, 17-20, 22-25 and 27-28 depends from one of claims 9, 16, 21 and 26. As discussed above, claims 9, 16, 21 and 26 are allowable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, dependent claims 10-15, 17-20, 22-25 and 27-28 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

9

VI.   Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicant has made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account 13-0014.

Respectfully submitted,

Harold C. Moore
Attorney for Applicants
Attorney Registration No. 37,892
Maginot Moore & Beck
Chase Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5109
Telephone: (317) 638-2922